

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/649,342	08/27/2003	Terence F. Kelly	6843-CON	4162	
22922	7590 09/27/2004		EXAMINER		
	T BOERNER VAN DE	MCELHENY JR, DONALD E			
	DA GABRIEL, DOCKET H WATER STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SUITE 2100)	2857			
MILWAUK	EE, WI 53202	DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application	cation No. Applicant(s)					
		10/649,34	2	KELLY ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Donald E.	McElheny, Jr.	2857	:			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n						
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is n	on-final.					
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	· <u> </u>							
Applicat	ion Papers							
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 August 2003</u> is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11)⊠ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
Attachmen	t(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date								
3) 🔲 Infor	ee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO er No(s)/Mail Date			I Date al Patent Application (PT0	O-152)			

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It lacks the claim for domestic priority as submitted in a separate paper.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1, 3-6, 19, and 23-27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1+ of U. S. Patent No. 6,654,689 B1 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: The only difference is that the issued patent has a claim limitation in independent claims of plural users and plural user profiles which has been broadened in the instant application and changed to a the singular user and user profile. The difference is number of users accessing a database inherently may be one

or plural and thus not only does not involve the concept of invention but as understood by those or rudimentary skill in the computer arts amounts the full equivalent and identical subject matter. Which raises the issue that Terminal Disclaimer cannot even be used to overcome such a minor change in claim limitations from that of the issued patent.

Also see also MPEP § 804.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1, 3-6, 19, 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Schwoegler (6,590,529 B2), which finds full support in its Provisional Application No. 60/182,352 for meeting the instant claimed features.

Explicit teachings exist of any of the communications modes to and from users, and tracking both weather conditions and a user's present and future positions and monitoring the user per their desired monitored weather conditions and notification criteria.

6. Claims 1, 3-6, 19, 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by either of Burfeind et al. (6,360,172 B1), Kennedy, III et al. (6,167,255) or Root et al. (6,505,123 B1).

Note that the user defined interest of location may be interpreted as either the user's supplied information they enter or that user data which is automatically generated from the user's device and location site by current location detection equipment such as by GPS, thus may be a fixed or moving location, and thus may be a present or future location. These references, and others cited of record, teach at least one of these interpretations.

7. The remaining prior art cited of record is also considered to teach the claimed invention concepts. Monitoring for various weather conditions and tracking their present and future paths and how they relate to a user's defined areas of interest (which may be their present location or future location) and advising the user, if they so desire notification and by what criteria and notification mode, are all well known in the prior art. Thus was known even projecting whether the user path, and user specified location of

interest, will intersect with the projected storm path and related dangers and then notifying the user of such potentials. Some of this prior art, which was cited in the parent application (now patented and noted in the above rejection), teaches such inventive concepts completely and together in combination. See Giniger et al. (6,199,045 B1), Lemelson et al. (6,028,514 and 6,084,510), Jones et al. (6,542,825 B2), Hoffberg (6,252,544 and 6,429,812 B1), Lauterbach et al. (5,278,539), Baxter, Jr. (6,023,223), Bottan et al. (US 2002/0042846 A1), and Smith (6,351, 218 B1) for additional references teaching correlating weather conditions as they change and their paths with a user's location of interest and notification of the user per their own criteria.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald McElheny, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-2218. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoff Marc, can be reached on weekdays at telephone number 571-272-2216. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/649,342

Art Unit: 2857

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Donald E. McElheny, Jr. Primary Examiner Art Unit 2857

Page 6